

REMARKS**Remarks**

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1-14 have been rejected.

35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Sigler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,830). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants submit that Sigler et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the features of “requesting a current list of available nets that the communication device may join” and “receiving a response from the controller that the communication device has been added to the list of current participants in the selected net” as recited in claim 1 of the Applicants’ claimed invention.

In column 17, lines 10-15 of Sigler et al. “a mobile earth terminal registers in step S2 and the user of the mobile earth terminal selects a particular net to establish voice communication therewith in step S4.” The Applicants would like to emphasize that there is no teaching or suggestion in Sigler et al. of “requesting a current list of available nets that the communication device may join.”

Furthermore, Sigler et al. fails to disclose “receiving a response from the controller that the communication device has been added to the list of current participants in the selected net.” (See steps S2 through S20 in FIG. 10A of Sigler et al.)

Also in Sigler et al., where first and second mobile earth terminals (METs) register with the mobile communication system and the first MET selects a closed user group network identifier (NET ID) representing a NET group including the first and second METs to establish voice communication therewith (Claim 1, (a) and (b)).

Sigler et al. fails to disclose a query operation that proactively requests a current list of available nets that the communication device may join as disclosed in the Applicants' claimed invention.

Sigler et al. simply selects a NET ID and then determines if "the NET ID received matches one of the NET IDs assigned to the MET" (col. 22, lines 19-23). If the NET ID does not match any NET ID assigned to the MET or if none of the following two cases is true:

Case 1: The Monitor code for the NET ID indicates a mandatory response

Case 2: The Monitor code for the NET ID indicates a conditional response and the condition criteria permit the MET to respond to the assignment

Then the MET ignores the NRCHA_SU and remains tuned to the GC-S channel. (col. 22, lines 23-31).

Also, please note that in col. 17, lines 34-35 of Sigler et al., "All METs are assumed to have joined the net group in step S20." There is no formal acknowledgment of receiving a response from the controller that the communication device has been added to the list of current participants in the selected net as claimed by the Applicants.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Sigler et al. fails to teach or suggest at least these features and combinations thereof as variously recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-3 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 1.

Regarding claim 4, Applicants submit that Sigler et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of exiting a net within a group communication network including sending a request to the controller for exiting the net and receiving a response for the controller that the communication

device has been removed from the list of current participants in the net and exiting the net and exiting the net as recited in claim 4 of the Applicants' claimed invention.

This is in contrast to the Sigler et al. patent which does not teach or suggest a specific mechanism for exiting the net as claimed by the Applicants. In col. 24, lines 25-30 of Sigler et al., the "MET then ceases transmitting, but remains tuned to the net radio frequencies, and continues to monitor the FES-C channel for the NET ID in accordance with the MET call monitoring procedures. After the user releases the push to talk, the MET waits for a time equal to or greater than the delayed time before enabling the loudspeaker again."

Additionally, in col. 24, lines 31-37, upon "receiving the Net Radio Call Release SU, the MET tuned to the FES-C channel retunes to the GC-S channel and deactivates the Net Radio call indicator to the user. The FES operates a hangtimer. When no activity has occurred for the hangtime duration, the FES releases the call. The hangtimer, perceived by a MET user is shown in FIG. 35."

The Applicants respectfully submit that Sigler et al. fails to disclose sending a request to the controller for exiting the net and receiving a response for the controller that the communication device has been removed from the list of current participants in the net and exiting the net and exiting the net. In Sigler et al., when no activity has occurred for the hangtime duration, the FES (Feederlink Earth Station) releases the call.

Sigler et al. fails to disclose the action of sending a request to the controller for exiting the net. There is also no follow up, where the controller sends a response that the communication device has been removed from the list of current participants in the net.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Sigler et al. fails to teach or suggest at least these features and combinations thereof as variously recited in claim 4. Therefore, for at least the

reasons presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 4 be allowed.

Claims 5-6 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 4 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 4.

Claims 7, 9, 11, and 13 recite related subject matter to claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 1. Claims 12 and 14 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 11 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above for the independent claim that they depend from.

Claims 8 and 10 recite related subject matter to claim 4 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 4.


CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 24, 2004

By: 
John L. Ciccozzi
Reg. No. 48,984
(858) 845-2611

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502